DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 228 HE 006 527

AUTHOR Biggs, Donald A.; And Others
TITLE Citizens' Attitudes toward the University of Minnesota.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Office for Student Affairs.
PUB DATE 12 May 75
NOTE 35p.
JOURNAL CIT University of Minnesota Research Bulletin; v15 n13 May 12 1975

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Athletics; *Community Surveys; Educational Assessment; Financial Support; *Higher Education; *Public Opinion; School Community Relationship; Social Services; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

A mailed survey was conducted of Minnesota citizens' views of goals and priorities for the University of Minnesota, their satisfaction with various aspects of the university and their familiarity with it. Responses were received from 409 of the 620 randomly selected citizens of Minnesota who were contacted. Key findings include: Most respondents tended to endorse a broad, multifaceted mission for the university. Within that broad mission, the most support was given to graduate and undergraduate programs oriented toward career preparation. Least support was offered for the provision of social events for students and athletic events for the public. Although large numbers of respondents felt inadequately informed to make judgments about the university, majorities of those who did answer reported being satisfied with the university system as a whole and with university students and faculty. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

office for student affairs RESEARCH BULLETIN

ED111228

CITIZENS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Donald A. Biggs
Student Life Studies

Gordon Wm. Kingston
Center for Educational Development

Ronald P. Matross and Deborah J. Seaburg
Student Life Studies
University of Minnesota

Abstract

A mailed survey was conducted of Minnesota citizens' views of goals and priorities for the University of Minnesota, their satisfaction with various aspects of the University and their familiarity with it. Responses were received from 409 of the 620 randomly selected citizens of Minnesota who were contacted. Key findings include: Most respondents tended to endorse a broad, multi-faceted mission for the University. Within that broad mission, the most support was given to graduate and undergraduate programs oriented toward career preparation. Least support was offered for the provision of social events for students and athletic events for the public. Although large numbers of respondents felt inadequately informed to make judgments about the University, majorities of those who did answer reported being satisfied with the University system as a whole and University students and faculty.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE006527

university of minnesota Volume 15 Number 13 May 12, 1975

CITIZENS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Donald A. Biggs
Student Life Studies

Gordon Wm. Kingston
Center for Educational Development

Ronald P. Matross and Deborah J. Seaburg
Student Life Studies

Economic and social forces have made the desire for accountability a dominant theme in the life of modern universities. Acting on behalf of the public, federal and state governments have carved out an increasingly larger and more direct role in the development of public higher education. While legislators and other government officials directly control funding, the citizens whom they represent remain the constituency to which a state university must ultimately be accountable. Surprising, then, is the paucity of systematic surveys of citizens' opinions of the universities which are supported, in large measure, through their taxes. In reviewing the literature on the subject, Biggs and Barnhart (1972) concluded that "...no substantial investigations of citizens' satisfaction with universities and colleges have been reported!" Although some proprietary surveys have been conducted since 1972 (e.g., for the University of Indiana, 1974), the systematic assessment of citizens' opinions on issues facing state universities has not been a routine part of the accountability process. Because of the time and effort involved in studies like this one, it is not recommended as a panacea; such surveys cannot substitute for sensitive day-to-day leadership on the part of university administrators and faculty. But the periodic sampling of citizen attitudes can provide a useful barometer for institutional decision-making. One of the risks in not periodically assembling representative citizens' opinions

is that a few individuals holding unrepresentative opinions may have an undue influence on university policies simply by being highly vocal and assertive.

The study reported in this paper is an extension of an initial survey of citizens' opinions of the University of Minnesota by Biggs and Barnhart (1972). They found that a sample of the residents of the Twin Cities metropolitan area expressed a high degree of satisfaction with several fundamental aspects of the University, including the students, faculty, and administration. The present study partially replicates the 1972 survey, but extends the sampling to include citizens from the entire state, and asks questions relevant to current University issues. Because the University is currently examing its mission, a large portion of the survey items are directed toward the assessment of citizens' views of the goals and priorities which the University should espouse. Secondly, the survey addresses citizens' satisfaction with a number of aspects of the University, while a final set of items considers citizens' familiarity with the University.

Method

Sample

The decision to employ a mailed questionnaire was based on a desire to obtain information from a large number of citizens at a relatively low cost. An alternative method for assessing citizen satisfaction and their perceptions of the University would involve personal interviews with citizens. While the personal interview approach has the advantage of producing an initially higher response rate than the mailed questionnaire, it is considerably more expensive if interviews are conducted with a sample large enough to be

representative of the state's population. Thus, of available alternatives, a mailed survey of a larger number of randomly selected citizens was judged to have the highest cost/benefit ratio.

A stratified random sample of 722 Minnesota citizens was drawn to proportionately represent the population of the eleven development regions of the State. The number of individuals to be sampled from each region was determined according to the proportion of the total state population residing in the region. Within each region, the proportion of population in rural and urban (cities with population of 10,000 or more) areas was also determined. Towns to be sampled were then randomly selected to proportionately represent the urban/rural distribution within each region. Finally, individuals were selected at random from the telephone directories of these towns. The number selected is sufficiently large to generalize to the entire state population.

Of the original sample, 620 were contacted, leaving 102 who were not contacted (87 insufficient addresses and 15 deceased). Of these 620 persons, 409 (66%) returned completed questionnaires. About fifteen percent (N=97) of those contacted refused to answer the questionnaire. The most frequently stated reason for refusal was lack of knowledge about the University. Table 1 shows the number of non-contacts, refusals and responses for each development region.

Comparisons with 1970 census figures indicate that those

citizens who returned the questionnaires may be unrepresentative of all state citizens as measured by socio-demographic characteristics. The persons returning the questionnaire include disproportionate numbers of males (60% vs. 49% census figure) professional occupation groups (27% vs. 16% census figure) and owners or managers of businesses (11% vs. 9% census figure). Farmers were represented to about the same degree as their frequency in the census but office workers (8% vs. 17% census figure), sales persons (3% vs. 7% census figure), skilled tradespersons (9% vs. 12% census figure), and laborers/factory workers (7% vs. 11% census figure) were all somewhat underrepresented. Respondents also include a greater percentage of persons having a college degree or graduate work (30%) than the general population (10% census figure). Persons with less than a high school education were underrepresented at 16% vs. a census figure of 40%. It is reasonable to assume that the overrepresentation of persons with higher incomes and educational level is due to the greater familiarity of these persons with the University, and, thus, a greater likelihood that these persons would return their questionnaires.

Questionnaire

Questionnaire items covered three major areas: (a) University mission, opinions about the priorities of university programs and activities, roles of various academic areas in society, and reasons for attending the U of M; (b) roles in University decision-making, opinions concerning student and faculty roles in decision-making;

and (c) evaluation of the University of Minnesota, tapping satisfaction with the U of M, and citizen evaluation and knowledge of teaching, activities and programs at the University.

Mailing procedures began with a preletter requesting the citizens' participation on May 20, 1974. The questionnaire was mailed three days later. Non-respondents were sent five follow-up letters, an average of one every ten days thereafter. Additional attempts to reach non-contacts and non-respondents through follow-up letters and/or telephone calls were made during February and March 1975.

Results

University Mission and Priorities

Table 2 presents responses to a series of items which asked citizens to indicate how important various goals and activities should be for the University system. Strong endorsement was given to the goal of preparing students for useful careers (89% rating the item very important) and two programs related to this goal, providing four-year undergraduate programs (70% very important), and programs for professional and graduate degrees (82% very important). Somewhat less support was offered for other vocationally-oriented programs, with 61% considering special training for part-time adult students to be very important and only 34% considering two year instructional programs very important.

Support for the concept of providing a liberal education was

indicated by the findings that 75% considered the goal of producing well-rounded students very important; 65% thought the goal of developing the moral character of students to be very important. However, the goal of making sure that the student appreciates the great ideas from the great minds of history was considered very important by only 23% of the respondents.

Student support and public service activities received less endorsement than did direct instructional activities. While a majority of respondents considered the provision of vocational counseling (66%) and financial aid (56%) to be very important, only 21% felt that recreational sports activities for students were very important, and only 14% considered the provision of extra-curricular social activities to be very important. Least support was given to the provision of athletic events for the public with only 13% very important ratings.

Table 3 provides further information about citizens' perceptions of the mission of the University. Four-fifths of the respondents agreed that the University should be primarily oriented toward career preparation, and that state citizens should be given admission priority. Somewhat less, but still substantial support was offered for the propositions that U of M instruction should focus primarily on the needs of young adults (48% agreeing or strongly agreeing) and that undergraduate students should pay the major part of their instructional costs (54% agreeing or strongly agreeing).

With regard to the role of individual campuses within the University system over 40% of the respondents felt that they were not sufficiently informed to evaluate the question of maintaining two-year instructional programs at the Waseca (42%) and Crookston (45%) campuses. Of those who did offer an opinion about these campuses, most agreed that they should be continued (50% agreed or strongly agreed for Waseca, 46% agreed or strongly agreed for Crookston). Citizens tended to support the concept of the Twin Cities campus providing a wide spectrum of instructional programs. Nearly three-quarters (74%) agreed or strongly agreed that the Twin Cities campus should continue to provide freshman and sophomore year instructional programs, while less than a third (30%) agreed or strongly agreed that the Twin Cities campus should focus primarily on graduate and professional education.

Special studies programs received mixed support, with 48% agreeing or strongly agreeing that a Women's Studies program should be provided, but only 11% agreeing or strongly agreeing that minority studies programs should be given funding priority. The proposition that financial decisions should assume parity between research and teaching programs was supported by nearly half the respondents (48% agreeing or strongly agreeing) but over half (56%) of the respondents felt that the intercollegiate athletic program should be self-supporting.

Citizens' perceptions of the University's mission were again

considered in a third set of questions, presented in Table 4. Citizens were asked to rate the importance of a variety of reasons for attending the University. Strongest endorsement was given to learning useful skills (74% very important), learning to appreciate and work with others (73% very important), and learning rational and thoughtful attitudes toward problem solving (60% very important).

Considerably less support was given to two traditional liberal arts goals of forming a personal philosophy of life (44% very important) and developing aesthetic appreciation (24%). However, citizens also offered little support for the two highly practical goals of increasing earning power (38% very important, 7% not important) and gaining power, influence, and renown (6% very important, 48% not important).

A final mission-oriented set of questions, displayed in Table 5, asked citizens to rate various fields of study according to their importance to improvement of "present day life" for most Minnesota citizens. The field receiving most support was the health sciences (considered very important by 82% of the citizens). The next most important fields to the respondents were agriculture-forestry-home economics (60% very important), technical fields (engineering, etc.) (59%), education (58%), and physical sciences (57%), each recording a very important ranking from about three-fifths of the respondents. Intermediate levels of importance were attached to law (49% very important), business administration

(45% very important), social sciences (39% very important), and biology (35% very important). The fields receiving the lowest percentages of very important rating were the humanities (24% very important) and the fine arts (22% very important).

Student and Faculty Roles in Making University Decisions

Table 6 presents a series of items on which citizens rated the frequency with which the University of Minnesota students and faculty members should participate in allocating financial resources, establishing degree requirements, evaluating faculty for promotion and selecting University administrators, determining counseling and advising policies, and determining course content. In all areas except that of selecting University administrators, the majority of respondents felt that students should be involved at least sometimes, but in none of the areas did the majority feel that students should always or usually be involved in decision making. Strongest endorsement of routine student participation was given for determining policies of counseling and advising services (45% always or usually), determining course content (37% always or usually), and establishing degree requirements (36% always or usually).

In contrast to their opinions of students' role in decision making, the majority or respondents reported that the faculty should always or usually be involved in decision making in all the areas listed. Strongest support for a routine faculty role was offered in the areas of determining course content (89% always or usually)

and establishing degree requirements (86%), and determining counseling and advising policies (72%). Least support was given for a faculty role in allocating financial resources (53% always or usually), selecting University administrators (55% always or usually), and evaluating faculty for promotion (57% always or usually).

Satisfaction with the University of Minnesota

Items displayed in Table 7 asked citizens to rate how satisfied they were with the University as a whole, as well as with each University campus and a number of aspects of the University's role. When asked to rate the University as a whole, over three-fifths (63%) reported being satisfied or very satisfied; five percent reported being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the remaining 32% considering themselves neutral or not informed. Except when evaluating the Minneapolis campus, the majority of respondents felt inadequately informed to make judgments about the individual campuses in the University system. Over two-thirds of the respondents rated themselves as not informed with respect to the Duluth campus, over a half not informed about the St. Paul campus, and over three-quarters not informed about the Morris, Waseca, and Crookston campuses. When respondents did feel qualified to express an opinion, their responses were generally quite positive, with only 1 to 3% considering themselves dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with any of the campuses.

Large numbers of respondents also considered themselves

inadequately informed to make judgments about several individual aspects of the University system. Over 40% felt they could not make informed judgments about the Regents' roles in University policy making, the role of the legislature in setting University policies, and the quality of University extension classes. In each of these areas, a plurality (28-46%) said that they were satisfied or very satisfied. Despite high numbers of individuals who felt uninformed (over 30%), a majority of respondents felt satisfied or very satisfied with two fundamental aspects of the University system, the quality of instruction programs (55%) and the quality of research activities (49%). In the eyes of the persons responding, faculty and students fared somewhat better than did administrators, Regents and legislators. Fifty-two percent of the respondents felt satisfied or very satisfied with the way the majority of University students conduct themselves (with 6% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), and 50% felt satisfied or very satisfied with the way the majority of U of M faculty conduct themselves. In contrast, 45% of the respondets reported satisfaction with the way the U of M is administered, 34% with the Regents' role in setting University policies and 28% with the legislators' role in setting University policies, with the legislature also receiving the greatest proportion of dissatisfied responses (11%).

Additional information about the satisfaction of citizens with the University was obtained through a series of questions displayed

in Table 8. Citizens were asked to compare teaching at the University of Minnesota with teaching at other institutions providing post-secondary education. The most salient finding from these items was that a majority of respondents (52-56%) felt inadequately informed to make such comparisons. Among those who did make the comparisons, more individuals thought that teaching at the University compared more favorably with the institutions in question than thought it compared less favorably. When the University was compared to Minnesota private colleges, other Big Ten universities, and all universities and colleges in the nation, the most frequent response among those offering an opinion was that the University's teaching was about equal to the teaching at these institutions. Comparisons with Minnesota state colleges, community colleges, and area vocational-technical institutes indicated that those offering an opinion most frequently evaluated teaching at the University more or much more favorably than teaching at each of these institutions.

Familiarity with the University

Table 9 presents responses indicating the degree to which respondents felt acquainted with each of the University campuses. More than four-fifths of the respondents felt that they were not at all acquainted with the Crookston, Waseca and Morris campuses, and almost three-quarters of the respondents replied that they were not at all familiar with the Duluth campus. Even for the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses, the majority felt that they were

not at all or only slightly acquainted with the campuses.

Further inferences about the acquaintance of respondents with the University can be made from Table 10 which represents the percentages with which respondents and their family members have attended the University of Minnesota. Twenty-five percent of the respondents reported that they had personally attended some branch of the University with 9% reporting attendance by their spouse, 14% by children, 4% by a parent, and 17% by a brother or sister.

Respondents were also asked to rate how important each of the campuses of the University was in determining their attitudes toward the University as a whole. In contrast to citizen reports that they were basically not acquainted with the Morris, Crookston, and Waseca campuses, Table 11 shows about half of the respondents rated these campuses as being very or moderately important to their judgments about the total University system. Nearly three-fifths of the respondents considered the Duluth campus to be very or moderately important in determining their overall opinions of the University system, while about three-quarters rated the St. Paul campus as very or moderately important. The Minneapolis campus received the highest importance ratings, with 81% considering it very or moderately important to their opinions.

The importance of personal experiences, the mass media, and the opinions of friends and family to respondents' judgments about the quality of teaching at the University was considered by the items

listed in Table 12. A majority of respondents rated each of the listed factors as either moderately or very important. However, respondents' personal experiences appeared to be the most significant in forming their opinions about University of Minnesota teaching. Over three-fifths of the respondents gave very important ratings to their personal experiences on the University of Minnesota campuses and to their contacts with University of Minnesota faculty and administration, while over half considered their experiences with University of Minnesota students to be very important. Next in importance to the personal experience factors were the opinion of the citizen's family (31% very important). Friends' opinions, local newspapers, and radio and television trailed, with each factor receiving a very important rating from less than 20% of the respondents.

Discussion

It is important to note that the present findings may or may not fully represent the views of all Minnesota citizens. The socio-demographic characteristics of the citizens who responded to the questionnaire may be unrepresentative of all state citizens. Those citizens who were surveyed tended to support a very broad mission for the University. Majorities of respondents gave very important or moderately important ratings to diverse functions of providing for two and four year undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees, student counseling and financial aid, basic and applied research,

adult education, public extension services, and recreational sports activities for students, and the varied goals of preparing students for useful careers, developing students' moral characters, and producing well-rounded students. Similarly, with regard to individual University campuses and programs, the present diffusion of services received support, with majorities agreeing that the two year programs at Waseca and Crookston should be continued, and that the Twin Cities campus should continue to provide instructional programs for freshmen and sophomores.

Although the trend toward support for a broad and diverse University mission is most salient, differences in the perceived priorities for goals and programs within the broad mission can be discerned. Career-oriented, undergraduate, and professional instruction programs received the highest priority in citizens' ratings. Less, but still substantial support was given to research activities, student support services, and other instructional programs. The lowest priority was assigned to the provision of social activities for students and athletic events for the public. Both of these functions received slightly important or not important ratings from a majority of respondents, with the largest number of not important ratings (21%) given to public athletic events. Further indication of the relatively low priority assigned to intercollegiate athletics was the finding that a majority (56%) felt that the University's intercollegiate athletic programs should be self-supporting.

In comparing the results of this study with the results of the Biggs and Barnhart (1972) study of urban citizens' satisfaction with the University, nearly 70% of both groups reported being satisfied or more than satisfied with the University as a whole. Additionally, in both studies majorities expressed satisfaction with the way most students conduct themselves, the way most faculty members conduct themselves, and the way the University is administered.

Among the possible inferences from the present findings is that state citizens would be expected to resist wholesale changes in the philosophy and scope of the University. Citizens appear to prefer a diverse and multi-faceted system, serving many individuals in many ways. Should cutbacks and limitations be necessary, "practical" degree programs oriented toward the furtherance of young people's careers would probably be in the strongest position, while intercollegiate athletics might be in the weakest position should its programs not be self-supporting.

An additional trend in the opinions of the surveyed citizens may have important implications. Whenever citizens were asked to make judgments about aspects of the University as it currently exists, large numbers tended to respond that they were not well enough informed to make such judgments. This finding suggests that the University could do more to disseminate information about its goals, policies and programs.

References

Biggs, D.A., & Barnhart, W.J. Urban Citizens and their satisfaction with a university, Office for Student Affairs Research Bulletin, University of Minnesota, 1972, 13 (2)

Minnesota State Planning Agency, Office of Local and Urban Affairs. Minnesota socio-economic characteristics from the 4th count summary tape of the 1970 census, April 1972, 2

Minnesota State Planning Agency, Office of Local and Urban Affairs. Minnesota socio-economic characteristics from the 4th count summary tape of the 1970 census, April 1972, 3

Summary Report of an Attitudinal Study regarding Indiana University Group Attitudes Company, New York, July 1974

Table 1

Regional Response Percentages

Region	Total N	Noncontact N	Nonresponse N		Response	
			Refusal	Not Heard From	Return N	Adjusted[a] Return Rate
1	15	0	3	3	9	60
2	6	2	1	1	2	50
3	62	11	13	6	32	63
4	36	4	5	10	17	53
5	23	3	5	5	10	50
6E	20	3	3	1	13	77
6W	15	1	1	0	13	93
7	47	5	5	12	25	60
8	30	5	4	8	13	52
9	42	3	7	4	28	72
10	72	4	9	12	47	69
11	354	61	41	52	200	68
Totals	722	102	97	114	409	66

[a]Percent responses for original sample minus persons not contacted

Table 2

Citizens' Ratings of the Importance of Goals and Activities

For the University System

Goals and Activities	N	Response Percentage[a] VI	MI	SI	NI
To prepare students for useful careers	402	89	8	2	1
To provide instruction leading to graduate and professional degrees (e.g. MA, Ph.D, Medical, Law, Dental)	393	82	13	4	1
To produce a well-rounded student whose physical, social, moral and artistic abilities have been developed	396	75	19	4	2
To provide undergraduate instruction leading to a four-year degree (Bachelor's degree)	396	70	24	4	2
To provide vocational counseling to students	397	66	28	5	1
To develop the moral character of students	396	65	20	10	5
To provide special training for part-time adult students through evening, extension and correspondence courses	401	61	30	7	2
To conduct research which is immediately applicable to solving practical social and technical problems	397	56	33	8	3
To provide financial assistance for students in financial need	399	56	30	12	2

Continued on next page

[a]VI = Very Important; MI = Moderately Important; SL = Slightly Important; NI = Not Important

Table 2 Continued

Goals and Activities (continued)	N	Response Percentage[a]			
		VI	MI	SI	NI
To provide information to the public through extension services	400	45	40	12	3
To conduct research which may not be immediately applicable but which may eventually extend man's knowledge	398	37	43	16	4
To provide undergraduate instruction leading to less than a four-year degree (e.g. two-year Associate degree)	395	34	41	18	7
To make sure that a student appreciates the great ideas from the great minds of history	398	23	44	26	7
To provide a program of recreational sports activities for students	396	21	44	25	10
To sponsor professional performances in art, music, theater and dance for the public	397	19	39	29	13
To provide a program of extra-curricular (out of classroom) social activities for students	358	14	34	38	14
To sponsor student athletic events for the public	396	13	35	31	21

[a]VI = Very Important; MI = Moderately Important; SI = Slightly Important; NI = Not Important

Table 3

Citizens' Agreement with Statements about Activities

Of the University of Minnesota

University of Minnesota Activities	N	Response Percentages[a]					
		SA	A	N	D	SD	NI
Citizens of the State of Minnesota should be given priority for admission as U of M students	409	44	35	9	7	2	3
Instructional programs at the U of M should be aimed primarily at preparing students for careers or vocations	409	38	43	8	6	1	4
The U of M should maintain the 2-year instructional programs in Agriculture, Technology, and Business which are offered at Waseca	402	26	24	6	1	1	42
Inter-collegiate athletic programs at the U of M should be financially self-supporting	408	25	31	14	14	3	13
The U of M should maintain the 2-year instructional programs in Agriculture, Technology, and Business which are offered at Crookston	404	22	24	7	1	1	45
U of M Twin Cities Campus should continue to provide freshman and sophomore year instructional programs	405	19	55	7	4	1	14
U of M instruction should focus primarily on the needs of young adults, 18-25 years of age	405	19	29	15	20	10	7

Continued on next page

[a]SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree nor Disagree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree; NI = Not Informed

Table 3 Continued

University of Minnesota Activities (continued)	N	Response Percentages[a] SA	A	N	D	SD	NI
The major part of the instructional costs for the undergraduate programs at the U of M should be paid by the students	409	16	38	18	14	5	9
In making financial decisions, the U of M should consider research programs to be as important as teaching programs	408	14	34	21	18	4	9
U of M should provide courses in Women's Studies which emphasize some of the contributions of women to society	407	11	37	35	7	3	7
In the future, the U of M Twin Cities Campus should be concerned primarily with providing graduate and professional education	407	9	21	16	31	12	11
The U of M should admit all Minnesota high school graduates who wish to attend the University regardless of their high school record or test scores	409	8	15	12	41	20	4
U of M instructional programs in studies of minorities (e.g. Afro-American Studies, Chicano Studies, American Indian Studies programs) should be given priority in funding	409	3	8	20	35	21	13

[a]SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree nor Disagree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree; NI = Not Informed

Table 4

Citizens' Ratings of Importance of Reasons

For Attending the University of Minnesota

Reasons for Attendance	N	Response Percentages[a]			
		VI	MI	SI	NI
To learn useful skills	397	74	21	4	1
To learn to appreciate and work with people	397	73	21	5	1
To learn rational and thoughtful attitudes toward solving problems	393	60	31	6	3
To form a personal philosophy of life	393	44	34	17	5
To increase their earning power	396	38	41	14	7
To learn to appreciate and make judgments about the creative and the beautiful	394	24	48	22	6
To gain power, influence, and renown	393	6	14	32	48

[a]VI = Very Important; MI = Moderately Important; SI = Slightly Important; NI = Not Important

Table 5

Citizens' Ratings of Importance to Society of Academic Areas

Academic Areas	N	Response Percentage[a]				
		VI	MI	SI	NI	ni
Health Sciences (Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing)	408	82	14	2	0	2
Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics	409	60	30	7	1	2
Technical fields (Engineering, etc.)	406	59	28	9	1	3
Education (Teacher training)	406	58	27	11	1	3
Physical Sciences (Physics, Math, Chemistry)	407	57	30	10	1	2
Law	409	49	35	11	2	3
Business Administration	406	45	39	12	1	3
Social Sciences (Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology)	400	39	36	17	2	6
Biology	406	35	37	20	3	5
Humanities (Languages, Literature, Philosophy)	405	24	39	28	4	5
Fine Arts (Art, Music, Theater)	364	22	35	33	6	4

[a]VI = Very Important; MI = Moderately Important; SI = Somewhat Important; NI = Not at all Important; ni = Not Informed

Table 6

Citizens' Views of Desired Frequency of Student and Faculty Participation in University Decision-Making

Decision-Making Activities	N	Response Percentages[a]				
		A	U	So	Se	N
Student Role						
Determining content of courses	392	14	23	37	16	10
Establishing ccurse requirements for degrees	391	14	22	31	18	15
Determining policies in counseling and advising services	391	12	33	33	14	8
Evaluating faculty for promotion	393	12	20	35	15	18
Allocating the financial resources of the University	392	11	13	40	18	18
Selecting University administrators	390	8	12	26	24	30
Faculty Role						
Determining content of courses	393	51	38	8	2	1
Establishing course requirements for degrees	392	39	47	9	4	1
Determining policies in counseling and advising services	392	30	42	22	3	3

Continued on next page

[a]A = Always; U - Usually; So = Sometimes; Se = Seldom; N = Never

Table 6 Continued

Decision-Making Activities (continued)	N	Response Percentages[a]				
		A	U	So	Se	N
Selecting University administrators	391	25	30	24	11	10
Evaluating faculty for promotion	391	23	34	27	7	9
Allocating the financial resources of the University	393	19	34	30	8	9

[a]A = Always; U = Usually; So = Sometimes; Se = Seldom; N = Never

Table 7

Citizens' Satisfaction with Aspects

of the University of Minnesota System

and with the University of Minnesota Campuses

Aspects of the University of Minnesota	N	Response Percentages[a]					
		VS	S	N	D	VD	ni
University of Minnesota System							
The University of Minnesota	398	16	47	13	4	1	19
How the majority of U of M student conduct themselves	398	10	42	18	4	2	24
How the majority of U of M faculty conduct themselves	396	8	42	15	2	1	32
How the U of M is administered	396	7	38	15	5	2	33
The quality of University instructional programs	397	10	45	10	3	0	32
The quality of University research activities and programs	395	13	36	9	2	0	40
The Regents' role in setting U of M policies	396	6	28	13	6	1	46
The Legislature's role in setting U of M policies	395	4	24	15	8	3	46

Continued on next page

[a]VS = Very Satisfied; S = Satisfied; N = Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied; D = Dissatisfied; VD = Very Dissatisfied; ni = Not Informed

Table 7 Continued

Aspects of the University of Minnesota (continued)	N	Response Percentages[a]					
		VS	S	N	D	VD	ni
The quality of the University Extension consultation services	397	11	30	11	2	0	46
The quality of University Extension classes	396	11	35	8	2	1	43
University of Minnesota Campuses							
Morris	391	5	13	3	0	1	78
Duluth	394	6	20	5	0	0	69
Minneapolis	394	9	41	9	2	1	38
Waseca	393	4	15	5	1	0	75
Crookston	394	4	12	4	1	0	79
St. Paul	392	9	29	7	0	0	55

[a]VS = Very Satisfied; S = Satisfied; N = Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied; D = Dissatisfied; VD = Very Dissatisfied; ni = Not Informed

Table 8

Citizens' Comparisons of University of Minnesota Teaching

With Other Institutions of Post-Secondary Education

Institutions	N	Response Percentages[a]					
		MMF	MF	E	LF	MLF	ni
Minnesota Community (Junior) colleges	393	7	19	16	2	0	56
Minnesota State colleges	393	6	18	21	3	0	52
Area Vocational-Technical institutes	392	5	17	18	6	1	53
Private colleges in Minnesota	393	5	9	24	9	1	52
All universities and colleges in the Nation	393	3	12	26	3	1	55
Other Big Ten universities	392	3	11	26	3	1	56

[a]MMF = Much More Favorably; MF - More Favorably; E = Equally; LF = Less Favorably; MLF = Much Less Favorably; ni = Not Informed

Table 9

Citizens' Acquaintance with University of Minnesota Campuses

U of M Campuses	N	Response Percentages[a]			
		VA	MA	SA	NA
Minneapolis	395	7	32	30	31
St. Paul	392	3	21	26	50
Morris	392	3	7	9	81
Duluth	394	2	8	16	74
Waseca	392	2	4	14	80
Crookston	394	2	3	8	87

[a]VA = Very Acquainted; MA = Moderately Acquainted; SA = Slightly Acquainted; NA = Not At All Acquainted

Table 10

Percentage of Citizens' Families who Attended (% Attending)

The University of Minnesota[a]

Family Member	Percent
Respondent	24
Brother(s) or Sister(s)	17
Child(ren)	14
Spouse	9
Parent(s)	4

[a] N = 409

Table 11

Citizens' Ratings of Importance of Campuses
In Determining their Overall Opinion
About the University of Minnesota System

U of M Campuses	N	Response Percentage[a]			
		VI	MI	SI	NI
Minneapolis	368	54	27	11	8
St. Paul	364	42	30	11	17
Duluth	361	26	31	18	25
Waseca	359	25	23	19	33
Crookston	358	24	24	20	32
Morris	356	23	27	18	32

[a]VI = Very Important; MI = Moderately Important; SI = Slightly Important; NI = Not At All Important

Table 12

Citizens' Ratings of Importance of Various Factors
In Making Judgments about the Quality of Teaching
At the University of Minnesota

Factor Influencing Judgment	N	Response Percentage[a]			
		VI	MI	SI	NI
Personal experiences with U of M faculty and administration	387	62	21	8	9
Personal experiences on U of M campuses	386	60	23	7	10
Personal experiences with U of M students	390	55	29	12	4
Family's opinions	389	31	37	22	10
Radio or TV programs and editorials	391	19	44	28	9
Twin Cities newspaper articles and editorials	391	18	45	28	9
Friends' opinions	389	18	36	32	14
Local newspaper articles and editorials	389	16	44	30	10

[a]VI = Very Important; MI = Moderately Important; SI = Slightly Important; NI = Not At All Important